

**National Park Service National NAGPRA Program Training Evaluations  
2005 – 2012: A Post – Data Entry/Beginning of Analysis Preliminary Results  
and Progress Report**

Museum of Northern Arizona

October 24, 2012

## **Introduction**

Through a cooperative agreement, the Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA) is working with the National Park Service (NPS) National NAGPRA Program analyze evaluations of Program trainings from 2005 – 2012. This report constitutes a post – data entry/beginning of analysis preliminary results and progress report. First, an overview of the training evaluations data set is presented. Second, results of a preliminary analysis into two questions, “Generally, what do you think of the training?” and “Generally, what do you think of the trainers?”, asked by all evaluation forms is presented. Third, issues encountered during the entry of 630 training evaluation forms into six tables in a Microsoft Access database are summarized.

## **Training Evaluations Data Set Overview**

NPS National NAGPRA Program provided MNA with 630 training evaluation forms from 28 trainings that occurred from 2005 to 2012. Six different forms were used to collect trainee opinions. The following table summarizes the data set.

Training Evaluations Data Set Overview Table

| No. | Training Evaluation Form Type | Seminar Type  | Location and Date             | No. of Trainees |
|-----|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1   | A                             | NAGPRA Basics Training                                | Sarasota, FL, 10/29/2009      | 24              |
| 2   | B                             | “   | Seattle, WA, 5/22/2009        | 34              |
| 3   | B                             | “   | San Diego, CA, 10/10/2008     | 41              |
| 4   | C                             | “   | De Pere, WI, 5/14/2008        | 31              |
| 5   | C                             | “   | Denver, CO, 5/1/2008          | 20              |
| 6   | C                             | “   | Phoenix, AZ, 10/13/2007       | 47              |
| 7   | C                             | “   | Salt Lake City, UT, 3/22/2007 | 9               |
| 8   | C                             | “   | Washington, DC, 4/17/2007     | 46              |
| 9   | C                             | “   | Norman, OK, 3/16/2006         | 44              |
| 10  | C                             | “   | Washington, DC, 3/10/2006     | 19              |
| 11  | C                             | “   | Columbia, SC, 5/6/2006        | 12              |
| 12  | C                             | “   | Juneau, AK, 5/29/2006         | 17              |
| 13  | C                             | “   | Craig, AK, 6/6-6/7, 2006      | 11              |
| 14  | C                             | “   | Location unknown, 11/14/2005  | 16              |
| 15  | D                             | “   | Santa Fe, NM, 5/8/2012        | 24              |
| 16  | E                             | Determining Cultural Affiliation                      | San Diego, CA, 10/26/2011     | 21              |
| 17  | E                             | NAGPRA Databases, Summaries, Inventories, and Notices | San Diego, CA, 10/25/2011     | 23              |
| 18  | E                             | Determining Cultural Affiliation                      | Seattle, WA, 5/11/2011        | 12              |
| 19  | E                             | Summaries, Inventories, and Notices                   | Seattle, WA, 5/12/2011        | 10              |
| 20  | E                             | Summaries, Inventories, and Notices                   | Phoenix, AZ, 10/5/2010        | 22              |
| 21  | E                             | NAGPRA: Writing and Managing a Successful Grant       | St. Paul, MN, 5/4-5/5, 2011   | 14              |
| 22  | E                             | NAGPRA: Writing and Managing a Successful Grant       | Phoenix, AZ, 10/6-10/7, 2010  | 12              |
| 23  | E                             | NAGPRA: Writing and Managing a Successful Grant       | Chicago, IL, 9/15-9/16, 2009  | 20              |
| 24  | E                             | Determining Cultural Affiliation                      | Phoenix, AZ, 10/4/2010        | 20              |
| 25  | E                             | Determining Cultural Affiliation                      | Chicago, IL, 9/14/2009        | 22              |
| 26  | E                             | NAGPRA: Writing and Managing a Successful Grant       | Seattle, WA, 5/20-5/21, 2009  | 23              |
| 27  | E                             | NAGPRA: Writing and Managing a Successful Grant       | Santa Fe, NM, 5/22-5/23, 2012 | 10              |
| 28  | F                             | NAGPRA Basics Training                                | Reno, NV, 11/7/2011           | 26              |
|     |                               |   | <b>Total</b>                  | <b>630</b>      |

While this was somewhat unavoidable given different training topics, the use of six different evaluation forms makes it difficult to easily assess the efficacy of Program training through the years. While general trends can be identified and evaluation, see below, further analysis will require breaking the data set into smaller segments by training/seminar type. This is complicated by the fact that the data currently resides in six different data tables with no clear one to one relationships. Given this, no statistical analysis will be possible. However, more specific trends in training evaluation opinions by training/seminar type are identifiable and will be the subject of ongoing analysis and reporting by MNA.

### **Preliminary Analysis of Two General Questions Common to All Six Evaluation Forms**

While six different training evaluation forms have been utilized and five different types of trainings have been offered, all of the evaluation forms collectively asked minimally close variations of the same two questions: Generally, what did you think of the training?; and, Generally, what did you think of the trainers?

For the, “Generally, what did you think of the training?” question, trainees answered this question by choosing one category out of a set containing five to seven ranked choices, usually including not applicable or no opinion/undecided categories as well. Tables Overall Training Satisfaction Form A through Form F present the responses to this question.

Overall Training Satisfaction Form A

| Overall, I am satisfied with this training | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable | Grand Total |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Total                                      | 7              | 11    | 5        | 1                 | 0              | 24          |
| Percent of Total                           | 29.17          | 45.83 | 20.83    | 4.17              | 0.00           |             |

Overall Training Satisfaction Form B

| The scope of the training was appropriate for my needs | 5 (Strongly Agree) | 4     | 3    | 2    | 1 (Strongly Disagree) | N/A  | Grand Total |
|--|--------------------|-------|------|------|-----------------------|------|-------------|
| Total  | 42                 | 22    | 6    | 2    | 0                     | 1    | 73          |
| Percentage of the Total                                | 57.53              | 30.14 | 8.22 | 2.74 | 0.00                  | 1.37 |             |

Overall Training Satisfaction Form C

| Overall, how would you rate your level of satisfaction with the content of the training in providing the technical information that you need? |                |                    |                                    |                   |                       |                         |                      |             |
|---|----------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------|
|   | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Not relevant/applicable | No opinion/undecided | Grand Total |
| Total   | 189            | 68                 | 6                                  | 0                 | 5                     | 0                       | 1                    | 269         |
| Percent of Total  | 70.26          | 25.28              | 2.23                               | 0.00              | 1.86                  | 0.00                    | 0.37                 |             |

Overall Training Satisfaction Form D

| Overall, I am satisfied with this training | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable | Grand Total |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Total                                      | 9              | 11    | 1        | 0                 | 0              | 21          |
| Percent of Total                           | 42.86          | 52.38 | 4.76     | 0.00              | 0.00           |             |

Overall Training Satisfaction Form E

| Overall Quality of Program | 1 (low) | 2    | 3    | 4     | 5 (high) | Grand Total |
|----------------------------|---------|------|------|-------|----------|-------------|
| Total                      | 2       | 2    | 2    | 34    | 127      | 167         |
| Percentage of Total        | 1.20    | 1.20 | 1.20 | 20.36 | 76.05    |             |

Overall Training Satisfaction Form F

| Overall, I am satisfied with this training | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable | Grand Total |
|--|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Total                                      | 5              | 17    | 4        | 0                 | 0              | 26          |
| Percent of the Total                       | 19.23          | 65.38 | 15.38    | 0.00              | 0.00           |             |

The top two positive categories (combined) were chosen 75%, 88%, 96%, 95%, 96%, and 85% of the time on each of the six evaluation forms. This indicates that trainees overwhelmingly were satisfied with training. From a general perspective, this indicates that the NPS National NAGPRA Program's trainings are viewed in a positive light. Very few respondents had a negative opinion of the trainings.

For the, "Generally, what did you think of the trainers?" question, trainees were asked for their opinion in the same way. The results are presented in Tables Trainers A through F.

Trainers Form A

| Training staff were knowledgeable and helpful | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable | Grand Total |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Total   | 12             | 10    | 2        | 0                 | 0              | 24          |
| Percentage of Total                           | 50.00          | 41.67 | 8.33     | 0.00              | 0.00           |             |

Trainers Form B

| The training was well organized and presented logically | 5 (Strongly Agree) | 4     | 3    | 2    | 1 (Strongly Disagree) | N/A  | Grand Total |
|---|--------------------|-------|------|------|-----------------------|------|-------------|
| Total   | 41                 | 23    | 7    | 1    | 1                     | 0    | 73          |
| Percent of Total  | 56.16              | 31.51 | 9.59 | 1.37 | 1.37                  | 0.00 |             |

Trainers Form C

| Overall, how would you rate your level of satisfaction with the presentation of the training in conveying its technical content? |                |                    |                                    |                   |                       |                         |                      |             |
|--|----------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------|
|  | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Not relevant/applicable | No opinion/undecided | Grand Total |
| Total  | 189            | 55                 | 6                                  | 2                 | 5                     |                         | 3                    | 260         |
| Percent of Total   | 72.69          | 21.15              | 2.31                               | 0.77              | 1.92                  | 0.00                    | 1.15                 |             |



Trainers Form D

| Training staff were knowledgeable and helpful | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable | Grand Total |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Total   | 10             | 13    |          | 0                 | 0              | 23          |
| Percent of Total                              | 43.48          | 56.52 | 0.00     | 0.00              | 0.00           |             |

Trainers Form E

| Instructor(s) Knowledge of material | 1 (low) | 2    | 3    | 4     | 5 (high) | Grand Total |
|-------------------------------------|---------|------|------|-------|----------|-------------|
| Total                               | 5       |      | 3    | 29    | 166      | 203         |
| Percent of Total                    | 2.46    | 0.00 | 1.48 | 14.29 | 81.77    |             |

Trainers Form F

| Training staff were knowledgeable and helpful | Strongly Agree | Agree       | Disagree    | Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable | Grand Total |
|---|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Total   | 8              | 14          | 1           | 0                 | 0              | 23          |
| Percent of Total                              | 34.7826087     | 60.86956522 | 4.347826087 | 0                 | 0              |             |

92%, 88%, 94%, 100%, and 96% of the time, trainees chose the top two (combined) positive categories in answering this question. These data indicate that trainees were as positive, if not somewhat more positive, about NPS National NAGPRA Program trainers when compared to their general attitude toward the training. Very few trainees had a negative opinion of the trainers. Taken together, these trainee answers to the two general queries indicate that the Program's trainings and trainers are viewed in an overwhelmingly positive manner by the constituency that they serve.

### **Data Entry Issues and Evaluation Form Structure In Regard to Further Analysis**

The following table contains a summary of training evaluation form data entry comments. These comments are the basis from which MNA will make suggestions to the Program for future training evaluation efforts. The comments also highlight some of the issues that the forms present in terms of data analysis.

### Summary of Training Evaluation Form Data Entry Comments

| <b>Training Evaluation Form Type</b> | <b>No. of Trainings</b> | <b>No of Respondents</b> | <b>Comments</b>   |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| A                                    | 1                       | 24                       | <p>-For the training and content evaluations, some trainees have placed check marks between the given choices. I have interpreted this to mean that their evaluation grade is halfway between the two choices, but this cannot be reflected in the database. For now, when trainees have done this, I have left it blank in database. Fix this by adding grid lines, therefore forcing trainees to make a definitive choice between the given options.</p> <p>-Some trainees have been making comments on specific topics in the training and content evaluation fields. For now, I have entered these comments in one of the two comment text fields.</p>  |
| B                                    | 2                       | 75                       | <p>- Some trainees did not understand the trainer/presenter evaluation box and left it completely or partially blank. Trainer/presenter name should be entered onto evaluation sheet before evaluation is given to trainees.</p> <p>-Trainees have often chosen multiple answers for questions for which they were supposed to only choose one answer. In the database, I can only enter one choice. For now, when trainees have done this, I have left blank in database. Make it clear to trainees that only one option should be chosen.</p> <p>-Some trainees have been making comments on specific topics (or trainers) in the training and content evaluation fields. For now, I have entered these comments in one of the comment text fields.</p> |
| C                                    | 11                      | 272                      | <p>-Trainees have often chosen multiple answers for questions for which they were supposed to only choose one answer. In the database, I can only enter one choice. For now, when trainees have done this, I have left blank in database. Make it clear to trainees that only one option should be chosen.</p>  |
| D                                    | 1                       | 24                       | <p>-For the training and content evaluations, some trainees have placed check marks between the given choices. I have interpreted this to mean that their evaluation grade is halfway between the two choices, but this cannot be reflected in the database. For now, when trainees have done this, I have left it blank in database. Fix this by adding grid lines, therefore forcing trainees to make a definitive choice between the given options.</p> <p>-Some trainees have been making comments on specific topics in the training and content evaluation fields. For now, I have entered these comments in one of the two comment text fields.</p>  |
| E                                    | 12                      | 209                      | <p>-On the box headed “Overall Quality of Program”, some trainees did not give a numerical evaluation for the overall quality of the program because they thought that this was a heading for the evaluation box and not an option to be evaluated. It should be made clear to trainees that this is something to be evaluated as well.</p> <p>-Trainees have often chosen multiple answers for questions for which they were supposed to only choose one answer. In the database, I can only enter one choice. For now, when trainees have done this, I have left blank in database. Make it clear to trainees that only one option should be chosen.</p>  |
| F                                    | 1                       | 26                       | <p>-For the training and content evaluations, some trainees have placed check marks between the given choices. I have interpreted this to mean that their evaluation grade is halfway between the two choices, but this cannot be reflected in the database. For now, when trainees have done this, I have left it blank in database. Fix this by adding grid lines, therefore forcing trainees to make a definitive choice between the given options.</p> <p>-Some trainees have been making comments on specific topics in the training and content evaluation fields. For now, I have entered these comments in one of the two comment text fields.</p>  |